

# The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No. 23.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1861.

WHOLE NUMBER 75.

## The Principia

Published Weekly, at 330 Pearl Street, (two doors above  
Hargre's Building) New-York.

WILLIAM GIBBES, Proprietor.

SAMUEL WOOD, Editor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

### PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound moral Christian reform, the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of the golden principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life—in the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and restoring Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible, our standard, the Divine Law; our expediency, obedience, our plan, the Gospel, our trust, the Divine promise; our penalty, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

### THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST.

Containing the testimony of the Scriptures against Slavery, and the Scriptural basis of treating it.

"To the Jew and to the testimony of the Jews they speak not according to this word. It is because there is no light in them." (Isa. i. 20). "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. ii. 15).

Part III.—Slaveholding brought directly to the test of the Bible.

#### CHAPTER XI.

#### THE HEBREWS IN EGYPT.

[In Continuation.]

"And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows, and I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians." (Ex. iii. 7-8).

"Now therefore, behold the cry of the children of Israel, is come unto me, and I have also seen the OPPRESSION wherewith the Egyptians OPPRESS them." (Ex. iii. 9).

"Then the Lord said unto Moses: Go in unto Pharaoh, and tell him, thus saith the Lord God of the Hebrews, Let my people go that they may serve me." (Ex. ix. 1).

God regarded the heavy labors exacted by the task masters, as OPPRESSION, notwithstanding their supply of "bread to the full." He did not regard their sustenance as equivalent "wages" for their involuntary labor. It was, in His sight, OPPRESSION, though they were not reduced to the deeper degradation and disabilities of chattelhood. He saw it was the Egyptians that oppressed them, the men who held them in that condition. He did not expend all His maledictions upon the mere system, excusing the contrivers and administrators of it, as do those who condemn "the system" of American slavery, but withheld the slaveholders who make and administer and support the system.

His remedy for oppression was the immediate and unconditional abandonment of it; a full and complete emancipation of the oppressed, without waiting for them to be "prepared" for the change. "Let my people go" now, not at some future period. Let the oppressed go free, even the people in the land of Goshen, where they are now, *even* in bondage, under existing decrees. There was no proposal to substitute for this, a stipulation that the oppression should not be extended into other portions of Egypt, by carrying some of the oppressed *whither*. No suggestion was made of limiting or localizing the evil. It was to be eradicated at once and forever. The command was explicit, imperative, admitting of no modification, and allowing of no compromise. The message to Pharaoh was, in these respects, exactly similar to all the Divine messages to oppressors, and concerning oppression, as recorded throughout the Bible, without a solitary exception. This is God's voice to all oppressors, and concerning all oppressions, on the face of the whole earth.

throughout all nations and ages. "Let my people go, that they may serve me"—with their bodies and spirits which are mine—both by Creation and Redemption. This, and nothing short of it, is God's claim on America, as it once was on Egypt. "I am the Lord, I change not."

#### EXCUSES OF THE EGYPTIANS.

We may imagine what kind of excuses the Egyptians and their monarch may have framed, for refusing to comply with the demands of God, by Moses and Aaron. They may have said: "What right has this foreign emissary, this non-in-law of the priest of Midian, to come among us, and interfere with our peculiar institutions? Are there not abuses and grievances enough in his own country, that had better engross his attention? Or if, as some suspect, he is himself a fugitive from Hebrew service and labor, why should he not be seized and not at work with his brethren, of his own caste? What rights can he and his race have, that the Egyptians are bound to respect? As he has been living for at least forty years at a distance from Egypt, what can he know of the condition of the Hebrews, and of the interests and policy of our Government? Do we not best understand our own concerns? The successors of these Hebrews came from the land of Canaan, and the curse of Noah upon Canaan, for aught we know, may still rest upon them. Certain it is, that the race have never yet been able to take care of themselves. Four hundred years ago, they were literally starving, in their own country, and were mercifully permitted to come here and settle, to 'save their lives by a great deliverance.' From a few scores of persons they have increased to as many millions. Our literature and our arts of civilization have been opened to them. Probably the first wagons they ever saw, were those sent up to convey them here. And some of them have been 'cleared in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.' When were such substantial benefits ever conferred upon such a people before? They came, not by compulsion, but by their own accord, and for their own good. And is it a great thing that they should contribute by their labor to the internal improvements of their adopted country? In what better way could they be taxed, than in the way that enables them to pay it by the labor of their hands, without money, when they might otherwise starve, like their fathers, for want of employers? Are not their flesh pots well supplied with flesh meat and vegetables of every description? Have they not fish, of which they eat freely, and cucumbers, and melons, and leeks, and onions, and garlic, and bread to the full? Have any of them complained of a lack of nutritious food? Are they not 'fat and sleek'? Do we not present the best conditioned, the most contented and happy peasantry in the world? Have not these meddlesome agitators only made their condition worse, by making it necessary for us to draw the cords tighter? Have not the laborers themselves discovered this, and upbraided Moses and Aaron as the cause of all their troubles? (Ex. v. 19-21). Should they be enticed away into the wilderness, who can doubt that they would soon find themselves in a starving condition, and wish themselves back among their flesh-pots again? (Ex. xvi. 3). What better answer could be returned to their religious than:—'Ye are idle—ye are idle. Let three more work be laid upon the men, that they may labor therein, and not regard vain words.' So long have they been indulged in doing nothing but to tend their flocks and herds, and lounge with them in the shade, that they think it too laborious to make brick and build cities. Fresh evidence that the Israelites were

made to set at work by the superior, the more enterprising. Is it not the 'manifest destiny' of the Egyptians, descendants of the, god-like Ethiopians? to subdue and hold in subjection the inferior races, whose skins are not colored like their own? Who, except fanatics, ever heard that the enforcement of involuntary labor without wages, and for the public good, is *malum in se*? And are not our laborers well fed, well used, and held in a condition immeasurably above that of chattelhood? If like some fabled nations of barbarians, we held men as property for sale, marriage, broke up the family relation, severing wives and husbands, parents and children, by selling them as bonds, and forbidding their education, there might be some ground of complaint. But with the enlightened and civilized Egyptians, these enormities are unknown, and are heard of with incredulity. Some compulsory labor there must indeed be, otherwise the world's work could not be done. Do not parents compel their children to labor? And is not Pharaoh the father of his subjects? Is not his authority, as being a civil ruler, heaven-ordained? What less than treason, rebellion, and impiety, can it be to refuse obedience to his mandates, at least until they are repealed? And has he not said 'I know not the Jehovah of the Hebrews, neither will I let Israel go'? Is not the question thus 'settled by the highest judicial authority in the land'? And who are Moses and Aaron that they should promulgate a 'higher law'? Why may not the monarch of Egypt have his hundreds or thousands of servants under his control, as well as other princes and patriarchs? Is not the institution a patriarchal one? And did not the far-famed patriarch Abraham have his 'three hundred and eighteen trained servants born in his own house'? If these Hebrews, are, as reported, descendants of Abraham, venerating his character, why should they complain of an institution to which he was indebted for his greatness? If they are his descendants by the bond woman, are they not still in their normal condition? If, by the free woman, may they not have forfeited their lordly ease by their dinnage of the institution they should have cherished, or else by their perversion and abuse of it? In every view, it is not evident that the holding of men in forced servitude, is not *malum a se*. And are we not lawfully using it, guarding well against its abuses? And finally, whoever may be the abstract right of the case, we make the institution as we received it from our fathers. Four hundred years of possession, of legislation, and of unbroken usage, have sanctioned and sanctified the servitude of the Hebrews. And that is right which the law makes to be right. We know there is a 'visionary dogmatist' that denies this. But we are 'practical men' and so one enjoying a reputation for statesmanship, will sacrifice the obvious interests of a great nation, merely in deference to idle theories and abstractions. "The greatest good of the greatest number" requires that the Hebrews should be servants to the Egyptians.

Such, in the light of modern excuses of a similar character, may be imagined to have been the excuses of the Egyptians. If, to us, they appear *imperfect* and *fit* for loss, what shall we say of those that, in our land, are heard daily? What intelligent and candid person, on looking over, carefully, the whole matter, can deny that such supposed 'excuses, in the mouths of the Egyptians, would have been quite as pertinent and as plausible as those now on the lips of Americans? Nay, how can we fail to perceive that many of them would have been much more so, especially when it is remembered that the Egyptian bondage fell so far short of American slavery, in its abominations and its horrors?

\* Gen. xlv. 1.

\* Ex. vii. 22.

\* Num. xi. 3.

\* Ex. vi. 3.

\* Ex. vi. 3.

\* 1 Ths. ii. 16.

\* Ex. v. 2.

\* Vide speech of Henry Clay in the Senate, 1833.





# The Principal.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1861.

LETTERS ON *Slavery* should be addressed to M. R. WILLIAMS, the publisher.

LETTERS FOR THE EDITOR, whether in commendation or for the press, should be addressed to W. WALLACE, (GROVER).

Orders for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

In all addresses, the business title should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or commendations for the Editor. No business papers must be kept on the publisher's file by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on a slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor on another, or on one should be another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

All letters to us should be carefully addressed to 339 Pearl street, not 145 Beekman street, nor to D. K. 1112, (the former address of Wm. Crozier, where some of his letters continue to be sent.) This is the most important note, as the office of our friends, there, is liable to be removed; and letters directed there will be liable to be lost.

## THE WAR IS UPON US.

It has come, at last. We are now involved in one of the most dreadful of all visitations, an intestine war.

It is by no foreign foe that the Nation is assailed. The enemy is in our very midst. It is not an enemy that has been made such by our aggressions upon their rights, unless it be in this one thing, that they were entitled, at our hands, to the restraints of salutary law, to prevent their aggressions upon our brethren whom they have enslaved. In this, we have indeed wronged them. We have educated them to the rebellion they are enacting, by permitting them to live in our nation, *without submission to righteous national law*. We have recognized their sovereign right, as they have claimed, and as we have conceded, a political and Constitutional right, to lord it over colored non-slaveholders, then they have had the same political and Constitutional right to lord it over white non-slaveholders. The permitting them to be slaveholders, was a virtual, and efficacious, though unconscious concession of that right. The permission of slaveholding is, of itself, and of necessity, the erection of a superior caste, a governing class, in our political system, and, of necessity, they have governed. In their present position of rebellion, they are only acting upon the necessities of their position, as the governing class, a position so long conceded to them that they regard it as belonging to them. The election of a President, without the leave of the long-established and recognized ruling caste, was, of itself, (however unintentional) an infringement of their prerogatives, as an oligarchy of slaveholders, and, in order to remain such, they felt the necessity of rebelling. To submit to the results of an election by a majority of non-slaveholders, without having been consulted, before-hand, and without having assented to the selection of the candidates, would have been a relinquishment of their long exercised and conceded prerogatives, as the governing caste.

The fact of slaveholding control is an unquestionable fact of our national history. In philosophy, though it lies in a nutshell, is not commonly understood. They have governed, not because of their numerical strength, for they have always been a minority — nor by virtue of their three-fifths representative of the slaves, for this has still left to the non-slaveholding States a preponderant majority in the Government, nor by the wealth of the slaveholders, for they have been comparatively poor. They have governed, solely by the necessities of their position, as an oligarchy of

slaveholders. For the first time a President has been elected without their leave, as a ruling caste, in other words, as slaveholders, and of course, they rebel. It is no object to them, to be slaveholders, unless they can continue to enjoy the long conceded and constantly exercised prerogatives of a controlling class an oligarchy, over the nation.

Hence the rebellion, and hence the war, in which we are now plunged.

The enemy is not confined to the slaveholders, nor to the South, because the advocates, the apologists, the sympathizers, and the servile tools of slavery, of slaveholding, and of the slaveholders, are to be found throughout the whole nation. As in our Revolutionary war, we had Tories over all the country, though fewer in the North than in the South, so we now have the partisans of the slaveholding oligarchy and of their supremacy, in still greater proportionate numbers. Every pro-slavery pulpit is a fortress of pro-slavery rebellion. Pro-slavery Missionary Boards and Tract Houses are its Sevastopols. Pro-slavery presses, religious and political, are its floating batteries. The operators of these may be comparatively quiet, as citizens, while disseminating the foundation doctrines of the rebels, so long as the forces of the Federal Government are successful. But let Fort Sumter and Pickens, the Federal Capitol, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and New-York Custom House, fall into the hands of Jefferson Davis, and the Ecclesiastical pioneers of the rebellion will openly and eagerly show themselves, as his supporters. Of this we have already had too early evidence and foretaste, in an utterance of one of their representative men, the letter of *Chancellor Walworth*, a pattern saint, of the pro-slavery faith, fully justifying the rebels, at the first outbreak of their Rebellion, and comparing them with the patriots of that American Revolution, (as though they had receded to secession in defence of liberty instead of slavery), has been widely circulated, at the North and the South, and has greatly accelerated and strengthened the rebellion. So has the letter of fraternity and sympathy signed by Gardner Spring, D. D., and other leading clerical gentlemen. The programme of the "National Unity Society" defending slavery, is another similar manifestation. All defences of religious fellowship with slaveholders, on the ground of the inherent innocence of slaveholding, however intended, are operating as weights in the same scale. For if slaveholding is good enough for fellowship in the Church, it is good enough to be protected, everywhere, by the nation: the demands of the slaveholders are just, and a pro-slavery pacification, according to the programme of the "National Unity Society," and the Constitution of the Confederate States, should have superseded the defence of Fort Sumter, and the war.

An intestine war, arising in consequence of the "irrepressible conflict" between slavery and freedom, in a country wherein the leading influences of the Churches and Ministry in general are in favor of slavery and against its abolition, can hardly fail to be a most terrible calamity. The Administration may ignore the true issue, in the contest — may undertake to put down pro-slavery rebellion with one hand, and catch run-away slaves with the other. But God and his Providence will not ignore the issue, nor fail to confound the Nation and the Government that does!

What shall the end of these things be?

## THE CAUSE OF THE WAR.

"The curse, *causeless*, has not come." The intestine war is not without a most guilty cause. What is that cause? Is it the agitations of the abolitionists? No. There must be a cause lying back of abolitionism. There could have been no abolitionism, had there been no slavery requiring to be abolished. And abolitionism, especially in the hands of a few despised, hated, and vilified abolitionists, could not have influenced the politics of the nation, so as to have produced intestine war, unless the nation had itself been conscious that there was something in slavery and its operations, that laid a foundation and necessity for political action, of some sort, against it.

If abolitionism is, in any sense, to be reckoned among the causes of the war, it is not the *guilty* cause, unless slavery is its guilty cause, if it *ought* not to be abolished.

The intelligible and consistent opposers of abolitionists, who charge them with the guilt of having produced the

agitations of the country, which have now resulted in war, have been driven to the necessity of defending slavery as a divine and providential institution, approved by the word of God. This is the position of the *National Unity Society*, the latest organized machinery for fastening upon the abolitionists the crime of plunging the country in confusion, dissension and war. But it is a position against which the conscience and common sense of mankind, in common with the spirit of true piety, revolts. The people do not and cannot believe any such thing.

Abolitionism, therefore, (the condemnation of slavery and slaveholding as sinful, and the corresponding demand, the name of God and humanity, that it be immediately and unconditionally abolished, cannot be the *guilty* cause, or the *real, primary* cause of the agitations that have resulted in war. As well might it be charged upon Christianity, that it is the guilty cause of the domestic and intestine wars that have been occasioned by it, and that Christ himself foresaw and foretold, so that a man's foes should be those of his own household. The enemies of Christianity have often resorted to this charge, but it has always been seen to be unreasonable and unjust. The charge against abolitionism is but a part of the same sophistry, employed for similar ends, to turn the edge of divine reproof against weak minds.

Slavery, then, and not abolitionism, or anti-slavery, is the guilty cause of degrees, phases, or manifestations, in the guilty cause of the war. The common sense of the common people, in harmony with the political science of the wisest statesmen, is rapidly coming to see and to understand this. *Slavery* and nothing else, has disturbed our national unity and peace.

Remove slavery, and you will have removed abolitionism, and henceforward, you will have no agitations, dissensions or wars, from that cause.

Remove slavery, and you will have removed the only real ground of political dissension in the nation, sufficient to produce insurrection, rebellion, or intestine war.

It is said that we were once on the verge of intestine war, on account of the Tariff. But the difficulty was settled without a resort to arms, or to secession. And, if the whole truth were told, it would be seen that slavery was at the bottom of that controversy, concerning the Tariff. Who was the father of the protection tariff system? John C. Calhoun, who proposed, and vehemently insisted on the first distinctively protective tariff, that of 1816. What was his object? To undermine Northern commerce, by which the North was becoming rich, while he complained that the South was growing poor. By a protective Tariff, he broke up some of the most lucrative branches of Northern commerce, and compelled the merchants to turn manufacturers of Southern grown cotton, for the benefit of slavery. The same John C. Calhoun, demanded, in 1833, the repeal of the protective Tariff. For what reason? Because he found that the North was still growing rich, while the South was growing poor. Slave labor could not compete with free labor. And so Northern industry must again be deranged to check its disproportionate prosperity. This was the real cause of the difficulty about the Tariff.

Slavery is the guilty cause of the war. Its national-bolence is the great national sin, for which God is now visiting the nation with his judgments. God overthrew Pharaoh and the Egyptians for the sin of oppression. He removed, first the Ten Tribes of Israel, and then Judah and Benjamin, into captivity in Babylon, for the sin of oppression. This he threatened by his inspired prophets, before-hand, and the inspired historians have recorded the fulfillment of those prophecies. All the ancient nations were threatened with overthrow by the inspired prophets, for the same sin of oppression. And the history of these nations proves the fulfillment of those predictions.

The known laws of moral and political cause and effect, established by the Creator, teach us the same lesson.

This nation is an oppressive nation, and from this oppression, and as a just punishment for it, the nation is now involved in war. To deny this, is to deny that there is any such thing as political science. It is to deny that any instruction is to be derived from history. It is to deny the overruling Providence, the moral accountability of Governments and nations, and the Divine Inspiration of the Bible. Men must become stark atheists or lunatics before

they can help knowing, however they may willfully deny it, that SLAVERY is the HEFTY GROSS OF THE WAR.

#### HOW THE WAR MIGHT HAVE BEEN PREVENTED.

The war might have been prevented by the abolition of slavery.—Slavery might have been abolished, by the simple process of voting for its abolition. The people would have voted for its abolition if they had understood and followed the teachings of the Bible, and if they had understood the Constitution of the United States, and had perceived how the Constitution forbids slavery in the States, and authorities and requires a national abolition of slavery by the guaranty to every State in this Union of a Republican form of Government, the establishment of justice and the securing of the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States, by the Habeas Corpus and due process of law.

Had the people but read their Bibles and their Constitution for themselves, they would not have been deceived by their false prophets and designing politicians. They would have known their duty to choose wise and good rulers, men fearing God, and hating covetousness, who would execute judgment between a man and his neighbor, deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof. All this they would have known and would have accomplished, had they but loved their neighbors as themselves.

The war might have been prevented, if the professed ministers of the gospel had faithfully declared the whole counsel of God, concerning oppression, and the duties of the people, the nation and its rulers to put an end to it, and if the members of Churches had sought such teachers, and had sustained them and heeded their teachings.

It may be said—it has been said, that such a course would have produced war. But the experience has now proved that the neglect of these duties has produced war. If war had been made upon us, for having discharged our duty, (not for having neglected it,) we should have had conscience and God on our side. But the strong probability, nay, the moral certainty, is, that if we had discharged our duty, we should have so secured the divine favor and the consciences of the people, North and South, as to have prevented the abolition of slavery, by the use of moral, ecclesiastical, political, and judicial action, without secession or bloodshed. Albert Barnes said that slavery could not be maintained, out of the Church, for a day, were it not maintained in the Church. And certainly, it could not have been maintained in the slave States, and had not been maintained in the non-slaveholding States. And then, there would have been no secession, and no war.

#### HOW AN HONORABLE AND PERMANENT PEACE, RE-CONSTRUCTION AND UNITY MIGHT BE SPEEDILY, EASILY, AND CHEAPLY RESTORED.

Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, I amed your ways and your doings, and I will cause you to dwell in this place. . . . For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings, if ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbor; if ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt; then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers, for ever and ever.—Jer. vii, 1, 7.

"Hide the outcasts, betray not him that wandereth. Let my outcasts dwell with thee. Be thou a covert to them from the face of the spoiler."—Isa. xvi, 3, 4.

"Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant that has escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with you, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him."—Deut. xxiii, 15, 16.

"Loose the bands of wickedness, . . . undo the heavy burdens . . . let the oppressed go free . . . break every yoke . . . Then shall thy light break forth like the morning, and thy health shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee, and the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward. . . . And there shall be of thee that shall build up the old waste places, thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations, and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in."—Isa. lxxviii, 6-12.

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."—Lev. xxv, 10.

"Cease to do evil. Learn to do well. Seek judgment; reduce the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. . . . Cease now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow: though they be red, like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land, but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the month of the Lord hath spoken it."—Isa. i, 16-20.

President Lincoln! Believest thou the Prophets? I know that thou believest, and I hast asked the prayers of God's people for His guidance and protection. Be-entreated then, to read carefully the first chapter of Isaiah, from whence this list of the above extracts is taken, especially the 11th to the 20th verses, inclusive: also the 58th chapter of the same book, and notice how strongly it is affirmed that prayers without liberating the oppressed, are an abomination in God's sight. Do not plead that you have not the Constitutional power. Study "Our National Charters," and you will find, (as thousands are now finding) that you have. Remember too, how John Quincy Adams, on the floor of Congress, asserted, without contradiction, the war power of the Federal Government to abolish slavery: And Gen. Jackson, to repel invasion, impressed slaves into the service, without compensation to the owners, and without asking their leave. As Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, it is yours, in such an emergency as the present, to proclaim martial law, and save the nation. Elevate to your post, by the voice of the people, and by the Providence of God, it is yours to protect them by obeying Him, remembering that His Constitution of Civil Government is paramount to all others, and supreme over all.

In this way, you may easily, cheaply, and speedily restore peace, unity and prosperity to our distracted country.

#### ANNUARY MEETINGS OF THE CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

There will be a sermon before this Society, on Sabbath Evening, May 5th, at the Church of the Puritans, Union Square, New York, by Rev. Jonathan Blanchard, D. D. President of Wheaton College, Illinois. Address at the Anniversary on Monday Evening, May 6th, at the same place, are expected from Rev. Messrs. J. A. Thom, Cleveland, Charles B. Boynton, Cincinnati, and C. H. A. Bulkely, Paterson, N. J.

#### TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Twenty-seventh Annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the Church of the Puritans (Dr. Cheever's), in the City of New York, on Tuesday, May 7, commencing at 10 o'clock A. M. In the evening, another public meeting will be held in the Cooper Institute, commencing at half-past 7 o'clock.

The Society will meet, for business purposes only, in the Lecture Room of the Church of the Puritans, at 3½ P. M. on Tuesday, and 10 A. M. on Wednesday.

THE NEW YORK (CITY) ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will hold its anniversary in the Cooper Institute on Wednesday evening, May 8th. Addresses by Wendell Phillips and Theodore Tilton. Admittance 10 cents, to defray expenses.

#### News of the Day.

##### Commencement of the Southern War.—Fall of Fort Sumter, &c.

On Friday morning of last week, at 4 o'clock, the war was inaugurated, by an attack on Fort Sumter, by the rebel forces in the batteries on Sullivan's Island, Morris Island, and other points. A summons for the surrender of Fort Sumter had previously been sent to Major Anderson, and had been refused by him.

Fort Sumter returned the fire, and the cannonading was kept up, except at brief intervals, for forty hours, when the firing from Fort Sumter ceased, and it was subsequently surrendered.

At several times during the battle, Fort Sumter took fire from the bomb shells, and was with difficulty extinguished. The Federal fleet was in sight all the time, but from some

cause, variously accounted for, rendered no assistance. The walls of Fort Sumter were battered severely, but not as was at first reported, broken through. Three or four men are said to have been killed, and a few others wounded. Few lives, if any, appear to have been lost on the other side. At the time of our present writing, however, Tuesday morning, full and authentic information has not been received. The telegraphic dispatches have been from the South Carolinians, and are received with some distrust, and allowance. For some time, the fact of the surrender of Fort Sumter was received with incredulity at Washington, New York, Albany, and elsewhere. Not until late on Monday, did it obtain general belief. Even then, it was considered a mystery and strong suspicions of the complicity of Major Anderson, of the Commander of the fleet, and even of the fidelity of the administration itself, were, in some circles, entertained. Up to this moment, an explanation of the mystery is anxiously waited for.

The N. Y. Evening Post, editorially puts forth, with great confidence, a solution which appears quite plausible, and may, probably prove to have been the fact. Instead of regarding the surrender of Fort Sumter a defeat of the Federal forces, the Post looks at its article.

"The first defeat of the rebels." The Editor commences thus:

It is evident that Gen. Scott has once more beaten the enemies of his country by mere force of his admirable strategic genius. He has done so, he has done so, he has done so, and only traitors, but loyal men, to rest under a misapprehension.

After referring to similar stratagems and successes of Gen. Scott in the Mexican war, the Post proceeds to say that the General perceived that "while Sumter and Charleston were points of no military importance, and that its retention would cost men and vessels, while the Government could not spare just now, he saw that the two keys of the position, were Fort Pickens in the Gulf, and Washington, the Capitol. He therefore made a show of defending Fort Sumter, concentrating the rebel forces to that point, but without no lives or treasures in its defence, employed his resources in a thorough re-enforcement of Fort Pickens, an adequate defeat of the rebels, both of which, the Post affirms, was effected.

In confirmation, the Post quotes the latest dispatches from Montgomery.

Meaning, while the rebels are ignorantly glorifying the victory of five thousand men over eighty, what news comes from Montgomery? The telegraph, in the hands of the rebels, says:

"Fort Pickens was re-occupied last night."

"It is understood that Charleston harbor is blockaded." Dispatches from Lieut. Sumner captured by the rebels, gave Davis the first intimation of his defeat! No wonder the rebel chief was "sick" and went to bed! No wonder that his Secretary, Walker, declined to make a speech. And what from Washington? These significant paragraphs:

"The report that Anderson has surrendered, and is the guest of General Beauregard, has been communicated to the President. The latter was not surprised, but, on the contrary, remarked, 'The supply vessels could not reach him, and he did right.' When he was told that the report was that nobody was injured in Fort Sumter, he seemed very much gratified, and remarked that he regretted that Major Anderson was not supplied, as the result of the battle."

"The next act in the play will represent a scene at Fort Pickens, in Pensacola harbor."

The Post resumes its remarks, and thus continues

The position of affairs is this: Charleston is blockaded. Fort Pickens is re-occupied by troops which the traitors foolishly believed were destined for Sumter. Washington is secure beyond peradventure. The traitors have, without the slightest cause, opened the war they have so long threatened. The country is roused to defend its assailed liberties, and gathers enthusiastically about the Government, and treason has been checkmated at the first blow it struck. Let them keep Sumter a few weeks.

The Tribune copies this article in full, for which we have no room. In another article the Post says

Charleston is blockaded. As we write news comes that Fort Pickens is re-occupied by the traitors—but Fort Pickens is re-occupied on Saturday.

In the meantime, the Federal Government is all active. The President issues his Proclamation and calls for 75,000 men, and the call is responded to with promptitude and enthusiasm.

*By the President of the United States:*

Whereas, The laws of the United States have been for some time past and are now opposed, and the execution thereof obstructed, in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the Marshals by law:

Now, therefore, I, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, President of the United States, in virtue of the power in me vested by the Constitution and the laws, have thought fit to call forth, and hereby do call forth, the Militia of the several States of the Union, to the aggregate number of 75,000 in order to suppress said combinations, and to cause the laws to be duly executed. The details for this object will be immediately communicated to the State authorities through the War Department.

I appeal to all loyal citizens to favor, facilitate, and aid this effort to maintain the honor, the integrity, and the existence of our National Union and the perpetuity of popular government, and to redress wrongs already long enough endured.

I deem it proper to say, that the first service assigned to the force hereby called forth will probably be to re-possess the forts, places, and property which have been seized from the Union, and in every event, the utmost care will be observed, consistently with the objects aforesaid, to avoid any devastation, any destruction of, or interference with property, or any disturbance of peaceful citizens in any part of the country; and I hereby command the persons composing the combinations aforesaid, to disperse and retire peaceably to their respective abodes within twenty days from this date.

Deeming that the present condition of public affairs presents an extraordinary occasion, I do, hereby, in virtue of the power in me vested by the Constitution, convene both Houses of Congress. The Senators and Representatives are therefore summoned to assemble at their respective chambers at twelve o'clock, noon, on Thursday, the fourth day of July next, and there to consider and determine such measures as, in their wisdom, the public safety and interests may seem to demand.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this fifteenth day of April, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and of the Independence of the United States, the eighty-fifth.

BY THE PRES

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *Secretary of State*

*The Available Militia.*—Should the Government require it, a military gentleman states that the following number of men can be forthcoming at short notice, and probably about the following contingents:

Maine	5,000	Michigan	10,000
New Hampshire	5,000	Illinois	15,000
Vermont	5,000	Wisconsin	5,000
Massachusetts	15,000	Iowa	5,000
Rhode Island	2,500	Minnesota	5,000
Connecticut	5,000	Kansas	2,500
New York	25,000	Indiana	5,000
New Jersey	2,000		
Pennsylvania	30,000	Total	154,500
Ohio	12,500		

The estimate would give to an army of three divisions: 62,500 for the Eastern, 54,500 for the Central, and 37,500 for the Western Divisions. This would do to make a beginning.—*Times*.

*The President and the Militia*—The President of the United States, by Sec. 2, Art. II, of the Federal Constitution is "Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia, of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States" and he is also, by Sec. 3 of the same article, empowered to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." But the power to provide for calling the "militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions" is reserved by Sec. 8 of Article I. to Congress.

How then, is it asked, can the President of the United States call on the militia, in the present emergency, or accept the offers of aid from the different States, without first calling an extra session of Congress? To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union and suppress the wide spread insurrection which now exists in seven States of the Union? The question is pertinent, and the public mind no doubt will be relieved as to the power of the President by accurate information upon this point. Especially so, in view of the failure to pass a force bill by the Senate. Congress has left the President in a very embarrassing position. The Chief Magistrate is without any power whatever in such a crisis, until he first calls upon Congress for authority.

The emergency is provided for by the act of 1795, which gives power to the President to call upon the militia in case of invasion, or imminent danger of invasion, in case of insurrection in any State against the laws thereof, if called upon by the Legislature or executive of the State, and, finally, "whenever the laws of the United States shall be

opposed, or the execution thereof obstructed, Life any State, by combinations so powerful to life suppress the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the power vested in the Marshals in this act, shall be held to be an act of the United States, and shall forthwith be treated as such, of an act of the United States, as may be necessary to suppress such combinations and to carry into effect the duties enjoined, and the use of the militia so to be called forth may be continued, if necessary, until the expiration of thirty days after the commencement of the then next session of Congress." The act also requires that, when the President deems it necessary, he is to resort to military force, and that he may cause the insurgents by proclamation to be persons within the United States.

The power bestowed upon the Chief Magistrate, under this act, is ample to enable him to deal with the present crisis in our national affairs. As the Chief Executive Officer of the District of Columbia, he is empowered to call upon the militia of such State or States as he may deem proper, to suppress an insurrection against the Government; and, as President, he may resort to the same military aid to suppress a combination, obstructing and opposing the laws of the United States, which is too powerful to be suppressed in the ordinary way. It is by virtue of this authority that he this morning issues his proclamation calling out 75,000 men.— *Tribune.*

*Infatuation of the Confederates.*—How completely the secessionists have been duped by the *N. Y. Herald*, the *N. Y. Day Book*, and kindred prints, will be seen from the following, from Geo. N. Sanders to the *N. Y. Tribune*.

"Montgomery, Ala., April 8th, 1861. The Union men of the North must plant themselves sooner or later upon the same ground as the plain people. I have to say, upon the Constitution of the Confederate States. I should like to be the first gun for the Great Republic. The N. Y. Democrats and Union men will soon reject all programmes not embracing the Constitution. I have no objection to the Government making cotton-exporting compromises are not even entertained here. The Ohio valley will never consent to a separation from the Gulf States, and the people of that section will accept this compromise. I am not surprised to see that you are more pleased with Charleston poetry than with Montgomery facts. But remember my prophetic letter to the Republicans last October. I have no doubt that you will be disappointed in the coming events. There be but one Government embracing the old Territories of the Union, and that cannot be that of the South. I have organized the New-England men later from the basis of a compromise. The New-England

"Montgomery," April 9, 1861. The Crittenden and Border State propositions are all bumbag. Beside the Jeff Davis, or Old Jeff Constitution, there is nothing else before the country. Douglas, Crittenden & Co., will have to cavo, and that much sooner than they think. There is not timber enough in their platform to stand a six-weeks' contest. Should Lincoln attempt a blockade, Davis will make war in every way, and in three months will drive Lincoln out of Washington. The Customs receipts at Mobile for the month of March, Jan. 1 to 31, 1861, were \$1,000,000. Last year, under the old Government they were \$1,000,000. Five times as many goods have been bonded there this March, as in the same month of last year. G. N. S.

When the poor "Confederates" shall have learned the facts of the case, how will they execrate their deceivers! Contrast their anticipations with the following :

*Public Sentiment at the North.* The attack upon Fort Sumter and its capture, together with the President's Proclamation has awakened a feeling, throughout the non-slaveholding States that is thus re-echoed by the *N. Y. Tribune*.

"For Sumter is lost, not Freedom is saved. There is no more thought of bribing or coaxing the traitors who have dared to aim their cannon balls at the flag of the Union and those who gave their lives to defend it."

We wish we could see that the "cause of freedom" is saved, or even that the flag of freedom has been raised by the Administration. Possibly that revolution may come next, when the "military necessity" for it comes to be perceived and felt. We are glad to find the public in a condition for being deeply impressed with new ideas, and for undergoing great and sudden changes, which may be for the better, as they could scarcely be for the worse. The first gleam of light we have seen is from a quarter least expected.

The N. Y. Times, only a few days before, had expressed the greatest horror, at the suggestion of some abolitionist, to accept the aid of the slaves, in the present struggle. But hear what the Times says now :

"If Virginia goes, Slavery in Virginia goes with her. *She loses* is every thing for which she secedes. With Washington retained, and it will be retained, if half a million of men can hold it, it would not be long before two great streams of migration, one North and the other South, would send every negro out of the State. Virginia may as well understand, first as last, the temper of the North, which is as united to day as are the people of Charleston,—that if she makes war by joining those in a

tual rebellion, we strike the rebels dead. We are no longer to be trifled or temporized with. We are ready for the contest. We did not provoke it. We sought every means to avoid it, but we have the permanent peace of the world as a guarantee to us. We are now ready to fight and break up the empire.

Why should not the same language be held toward all the seceded States, even upon the low ground of *the Times*, to say nothing of the original national duty to liberate all the slaves?

So far as the supporters of the Administration are fitting down, it is a counsel the North is approaching toward unanimity with great rapidity. Stephen A. Douglas has called on the President, and has assumed the role of earnest support. Mr. President Buchanan has declined the same. "One of the most prominent Democrats in Ohio" has done the same. The papers teem with accounts of the general enthusiasm, in all parts of the non-slaveholding States. "Mr. Curtin of Pennsylvania takes the President that his State is ready to furnish 100,000 men, at 48 hours notice, if necessary, to defend Washington City. Gov. Morgan will issue his proclamation, calling for 25,000 volunteers. Gov. Sprague of Rhode Island tenders the services of the Marine Artillery, and the Governor of New York, among them himself. The Providence Herald offers to loan the Governor 50,000 arm the troops. The Governor of Massachusetts responds to the President's requisition for 20,000 troops immediately. Volunteers to the number of 30,000 have offered themselves in Boston. Gov. Washburn of Maine, in reply to the requisition of the Secretary of War for troops replied: "Maine will respond promptly to your call. The people of this State of all parties will rally with alacrity for the maintenance of the Government and the defence of the flag."

From every part of the North, says the Tribune, the telegraph brings the gratifying assurance that the people are rising with one voice, to the support of the Government.

These may serve as specimens.

*New York City.* But no-where, perhaps, is the sudden change so marked and visible as in this pre-eminently pro-slavery city of New York, the very centre of treasonable conspiracies in favor of the secessionists, up to the day of the attack on Fort Sumter.

The *Herald*, with the largest daily circulation of any paper in the city, has been, more than any other paper, North or South, perhaps, the chief fomenter of the sedition. Even after the Sutter surrender, it ventured to call a meeting against "coercion," in the Park. But nobody, on that side, showed their heads, and the small gathering that assembled from curiosity improved the time in opposite demonstrations. The title of indignation against the *Herald*, soon became intense, and almost irrepressible, not so much from the Republicans and anti-slavery men, who cared little about it, as from the *Herald* itself. The *Herald* was then and is still, clad with its hypocritical cry for "Union" when it only meant pro-secessionary division and treason. Finding the *Herald* now the open advocate of disunion and rebellion, they were bent on revenge. The city was flooded with violent show bills against the *Herald*. The office was surrounded; the Police, (so constantly abused by the *Herald*), had to be sent for. Mayor Wood, who had lately counselled the secession of New York City itself, was forced to issue a tame proclamation, counselling moderation and peace. Bennett, of the *Herald*, on leaving his office for the next day, was escorted by a boiling populace, threatening to burn him down. The occupancy of the *Herald* office, to propitiate the crowd, had raised the National flag over the building. The very next day (Tuesday) the *Herald* tried a complete somersault, commending the administration for its course, and declaring that the time is past for holding such "peace meetings." The *Times* of Wednesday, publishes, in opposite columns, the diametrically opposite utterances of the *Herald* on Monday and Tuesday. It was feared that the popular indignation against the *Herald*, notwithstanding its sudden backing down, would not be so easily convinced. But the *Herald* did not sink, and for the thirty-first of a cold North East wind of wind and rain, which kept the people from clustering and standing in the streets, throughout all Tuesday.

*Journal of Commerce*.—But the rain storm did not prevent hundreds of merchants, lawyers, bankers and brokers, downtown, from promptly stopping their subscriptions to the *Journal of Commerce*, for its still persistent apoplexy for treason. If the subscribers to that paper and the *N. Y. Observer*, throughout the North and West, would promptly follow the example, not waiting (as our citizens did not) for their subscriptions, pre-paid, to run out, it would be of more ser-



